REMARKS

I believe based on the Examiner's comments that he still does not understand the invention described in the claims of the present application. The Examiner has requested that applicant explain in more detail what the invention is.

As stated in applicant's response to arguments, the Examiner states that all types of advertisements includes embedded links including ads in newspaper and TV. The idea of applicant's invention is not to use an embedded link. That is the major difference between applicant's invention and the prior art.

Matsumoto specifically teaches an index URL embedded in the ad. That is the whole gist of Matsumoto's invention. By determining which URL was entered into, Matsumoto can determine where the ad came from because the URL is embedded in the ad. For example, if a website was www.baseball.com, if a user put in a newspaper ad to go on the website to www.baseball1.com, which went to that website, the website manager would know that putting in the second website, that a user got that website from that specific newspaper ad.

The Examiner states again that the mail magazine is a source of advertisement which utilizes a code embedded therein. Because of the embedded code, Matsumoto does not compare information to determine what advertisement drove a user to a specific website. The Examiner cites to col. 8, lines 53-63 and col. 9, to show that Matsumoto compares data from a first database and index log file to determine what advertisements caused the users

to perform specific actions. The claims do not relate to what specific actions are performed on a website as described in the section cited by the Examiner. The invention and the claims only relates to determining what advertisement got a user to enter a website, not what the user did on the website.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 10 as being anticipated by Matsumoto. Claim 10 requires providing information where said ads are run demographically and date and time ads are run to a database of a system. The Examiner points to col. 7, lines 4-45. This refers to an embedded identification code which goes against what is taught in the present invention and is not used to show demographics, date and time of ad.

The Examiner states that Cols. 8 and 9 compare timing and location of advertising to timing and location of when a user logs onto a website. The Examiner points to no specific wording which states this. In fact, as stated above, this goes against what is taught by Matsumoto, since Matsumoto specifically teaches an embedded URL. As stated specifically at col. 9, the URL is embedded and that is what is used to determine why the user logged into the cite. There is no reason to compare time and location of advertising to time and location of user to log on the website as to URL. Therefore, Claim 10 is not anticipated or obvious over the prior art.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 as being obvious over Matsumoto.

Again, as stated above, the system of Matsumoto does not compare information from a first database with information from an index log file to determine which of the non internet ads generated the web clicks. As stated above, Matsumoto uses an embedded URL and therefore it would be illogical to Matsumoto to compare databases to determine why a non internet ad generated a specific web click. The Examiner specifically states that the user's IP address does not have to be stored because Matsumoto's system uses a system URL embedded in the ad. That is the exact reason why Matsumoto does not make obvious or anticipate the claims of the present invention.

For the reasons stated above, all of the dependent claims are not obvious over the prior art.

Applicant now believes the application is in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EM 329982073 US
Date of Deposit: February 16, 2010
I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313

Signature: Debbie Broderick
Name: Debbie Broderick

Respectfully submitted,

Philip M. Weiss
Reg. No. 34,751
Attorney for Applicant
Weiss & Weiss
300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251
Mineola, NY 11501
516-739-1500